

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 * * *

4 ANDES INDUSTRIES, INC. and PCT
5 INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

6 Plaintiffs,

7 v.

8 CHENG SUN LAN; KUN-TE YANG;
9 CHI-JEN (DENNIS) LAN; POLAR
10 STAR MANAGEMENT LTD.;
11 EZCONN CORPORATION; and
EGTRAN CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-00400-APG-GWF

**ORDER REGARDING MOTION FOR
ATTORNEY'S FEES**

(Dkt. #101)

12 Defendants EZconn Corporation and eGTran Corporation (collectively "Defendants") have
13 moved for an award of their attorneys' fees incurred in connection with this matter. (Dkt. #101.)
14 While I am inclined to award some of their fees, Defendants' motion overreaches.

15 "If state substantive law governs a case, then an award of attorney fees is also governed by
16 state law." *Muniz v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 738 F.3d 214, 218 (9th Cir. 2013). Federal courts in
17 diversity cases follow the law of the state in which the district court is held, including with respect
18 to issues of conflict of laws. *Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 78 (1938). "Nevada tends to
19 follow the Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws (1971) in determining choice-of-law questions
20 involving contracts. . . ." *Progressive Gulf Ins. Co. v. Faehnrich*, 752 F.3d 746, 750 (9th Cir. 2014)
21 (quoting from the Supreme Court of Nevada's opinion on the referred question). "The law of the
22 state chosen by the parties to govern their contractual rights and duties will be applied, even if the
23 particular issue is one which the parties could have resolved by an explicit provision in their
24 agreement directed to that issue." Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws §187(1) (1971). Here,
25 the subject contract states that it is governed by Arizona law.
26
27
28

1 Under Arizona law, the court may award the successful party reasonable attorneys' fees in
2 any contested action arising out of a contract, express or implied. Ariz. Rev. Stat. §12-341.01. This
3 statute is not intended to punish but instead to "mitigate the burden of the expense of litigation to
4 establish a just claim or a just defense. It need not equal or relate to the attorney fees actually paid
5 or contracted, but the award may not exceed the amount paid or agreed to be paid." Ariz. Rev. Stat.
6 § 12-341.01(B).

7 Defendants request an award of all of the fees and costs they have incurred in connection
8 with this matter. Such an award is inappropriate at this time because it presumes Defendants were
9 successful in the entire litigation. Defendants merely prevailed on their efforts to dismiss the case
10 on jurisdictional grounds. The litigation lives on in the District of Arizona. Defendants' counsel
11 expended significant efforts researching, analyzing, and preparing to address the underlying claims.
12 Because the parties' dispute is still being litigated in Arizona, the work of Defendants' counsel
13 related to issues other than jurisdiction will be used in that case. Defendants' ability to recover fees
14 for that work should be decided by the judge who addresses those claims. I will address only the
15 fees and costs related to the jurisdictional issues.

16 Defendants were successful on their motion to dismiss based on lack of personal
17 jurisdiction. (Dkt. ##18, 75.) Thus, they are entitled to recover reasonable fees and costs incurred
18 in connection with the following related motions: eGtran's motion to dismiss (Dkt. #18), plaintiffs'
19 motion to conduct jurisdictional discovery (Dkt. #35), plaintiffs' motion for interim protective order
20 (Dkt. #47), EZconn's motion to dismiss (Dkt. #75), and Defendants' motion for entry of final
21 judgment (Dkt. #88).¹

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ¹ Defendants may not recover for work related to plaintiffs' motion to transfer (Dkt. #92)
or their response to that motion (Dkt. #96).

1 Local Rule 54-16(b) requires a party seeking to recover fees to provide a “reasonable
2 itemization and description of the work performed” and an “itemization of all costs sought to be
3 charged as part of the fee award and not otherwise taxable pursuant to LR 54-1 through 54-15.”
4 Defendants’ motion and affidavits do not provide this information. Rather, they contain summaries
5 of work that was performed during various time frames. (Dkt. #102 at 4-10.) There is no way for
6 me to determine whether the time incurred was reasonable for the particular task. There is no
7 indication of who performed what tasks (e.g., did the partner perform tasks that should have been
8 reasonably delegated to the associate?). Nor is there an itemization of costs. Thus, I cannot award
9 fees to Defendants at this time.

10 Local Rule 54-16(c) provides that “[f]ailure to provide the information required by LR 54-
11 16(b) and (c) in a motion for attorneys’ fees constitutes a consent to the denial of the motion.”
12 Denial is not mandatory, however, and I will allow Defendants an opportunity to supplement their
13 motion with the information required by Local Rule 54-16. Defendants shall file a supplement to
14 their motion, with redacted bills and other information required by Local Rule 54-16, within 14
15 days of entry of this Order. Plaintiffs shall have 14 days thereafter to file any opposition to that
16 supplement. No other briefing is permitted without further court order.

17 DATED this 22nd day of February, 2016.

18 
19 _____
20 ANDREW P. GORDON
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28